Ham-Policy Digest   Sun, 29 May 94   Volume 94 : Issue 226

Today's Topics:
                    2m QSO's and Callsigns (2 msgs)
                        CW is fun! (3 msgs)
                      How can I get started?
                      How do I get started?
           Merge the CW test with the Theory Test (5 msgs)
                   Where and How can I get started

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 28 May 94 18:51:05 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!fc.hp.com!jws@hplabs.hpl.hp.com
Subject: 2m QSO's and Callsigns
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Many hams apparently still don't know the ID rules changed a few years back,
and that identifying the other station you're talking to is no longer
required. New hams seem to pick up the habit from some of the old-timers,
and the "tradition" continues.

John, NK0R

Date: Sat, 28 May 1994 00:07:28 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!gatech!news.ans.net!
mailhost.interaccess.com!dyna2-3.interaccess.com!astaniec@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: 2m QSO's and Callsigns
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>If memory serves me, we are required to ident every 10 minutes, and also
>at the end of an exchange. Many times I'll hear two people finish
>a QSO, usually on a repeater, and each will say something like
>XXXXX this is XXXXX, each giving the other persons call and then their
>own. I didn't realize the FCC rules required us to repeat each others
>callsigns! So if they don't have to do this, why do they, and will
>I receive friction from others if I don't do it as well? I have enough
>to memorize as a software developer without having to commit calls to
>memory so I can repeat them at QSO's end!
>

You don't need to repeat the other stations call, but it is a sign
of courtesy that you try to remember who you are talking to. Kind of
like using the person's name during the conversation. People like to
hear their name used and hams like to hear that other people remember
their callsign.

Don't you think that's a neat idea, Mike?

<see what I mean?>

73

===

Art Staniec - N9UOF | I've never gone looking for trouble.
astaniec@home.interaccess.com | It was always out there waiting...
                                 | -Mack Bolan

===

Date: 27 May 1994 17:14:33 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!
panix!ddsw1!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!cmoore@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW is fun!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Michael Silva (mjsilva@ted.win.net) wrote:
: I can't make up my own mind on the subject, although I do have
: leanings. I was just trying to point out the errors in what is becoming
: an anti-code cliche. Mike, KK6GM

Hi Mike, did you mean clique? I'm not anti-code, I'm just pro-choice. I

think it's wrong for pro-lifers to barricade abortion clinics and I think
it's wrong for pro-coders to barricade amateur radio.

73, KG7BK, CecilMoore@delphi.com

Date: Fri, 27 May 1994 14:22:40 GMT
From: walter!dancer.cc.bellcore.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: CW is fun!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2s0gar$fva@abyss.west.sun.com>,
Dana Myers <myers@spot.West.Sun.COM> wrote:
>In article 275@ted.win.net, mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:
>>In article <756Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) writes:
   A Model-T is an awesome thing. As is a good horse. But I see no reason to
   require a test of riding a horse for a drivers license.

>>This "analogy" keeps appearing where ever the code is discussed, with
>>the intended effect being something like "yep, those code folks are
>>about a century behind the times, har har!"
>>Here's how the analogy should go. See if it makes any difference:
        .... text deleted ....

>>And that's why a knowledge of horsemanship is required to get a HF'ania
>>drivers license.

>No, the reason the horsemanship is required is because HF'mania is
>a member of a treaty that requires horsemanship for travel between
>countries, and the treaty hasn't been updated quite yet.

BUT...
The treaty doesn't require Olympic horsemanship, it only requires
demonstrating a knowledge of horsemanship...so why does the HF'mania
crowd continue to argue for demonstrating a skill level
far above that required by the treaty :-)

>But, CW is fun. Doesn't mean it should be a hard test requirement, though.

Agreed, per my comment above.

73s

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)

Morristown, NJ   email via UUCP   bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays   email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

----

Date: 28 May 94 18:36:33 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!apple.com!apple.com!not-for-mail@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: CW is fun!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

rfm@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard McAllister) writes:

>In article <275@ted.win.net> mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:

>>Almost half the roads in the country (of HF'ania, if you please), are
>>reserved for horses only, although a horse can legally use *any* road
>>in the country.

>Bzzzt. The only CW-only bands are VHF.

Notice that a horse may be allowed to use any road, but the rider has
to qualify as a jockey to be allowed to use all the available horse
trails.

The crazier rule is that you have to qualify as a jockey to operate
voice-controlled station wagons on certain lanes on Hwy 20. Heck, you
even have to become a jockey to ride a horse to the moon!

Don't make much horse sense, does it?

By the way, there are lots of riders testing their horses on the horse
trails this weekend. Some long-distance riders even change the names of
their horses to make them more appealing for this weekend's test.

73,

Kok Chen, AA6TY   kchen@apple.com
Apple Computer, Inc.

Date: 28 May 94 13:32:05 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!nntp.cs.ubc.ca!
torn!news.unb.ca!coranto.ucs.mun.ca!nstn.ns.ca!nstn.ns.ca!nntp-
user@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: How can I get started?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hello There!
I'm a student who is trying to start a radio station in my high school. I've been
reading this newsgroup for two weeks now but I'm still confused about the
equipment and terms you use. If you could simplifiy the steps I would need to
get my radio station going I would be very thankfull. I am also unfamiliar
with the lincencing and policies. The more simple information the better.

Thanks in advance!
Charles.

Date: 28 May 94 13:05:35 GMT
From: agate!library.ucla.edu!psgrain!nntp.cs.ubc.ca!torn!news.unb.ca!
coranto.ucs.mun.ca!nstn.ns.ca!nstn.ns.ca!nntp-user@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: How do I get started?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

HEY! I'm looking for some information on how to start my own high school
radio station. Any advice would be greatly appreachiated. I've been reading
this newsgroup for a while now but I still feel unfamiliar with the terms and
equipment you use. Once again I'd love some info. on how to go about setting
up my own radio station (for high school).

Thank You Very Much,

Charles.

Date: 28 May 94 13:15:40 GMT
From: news.delphi.com!BIX.com!hamilton@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Merge the CW test with the Theory Test
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

>Well, it's been several days now and no one seems to want
>to comment on the suggestion that, except for the 5wpm
>exam, that the 13wpm and 20wpm 10 question CW tests simply
>be merged for scoring with the theory tests for general and
>advanced.

I've got a better idea: we'll combine not only the scoring, but
also the tests themselves. The VE's will send all the theory
questions in code, you copy and work them and send the results

back, also in code.

(Can you tell I'm also getting pretty tired of hearing the same
arguments over and over, too?)

Regards,
Doug Hamilton   KD1UJ   hamilton@bix.com   Ph 508-358-5715
Hamilton Laboratories, 13 Old Farm Road, Wayland, MA 01778-3117, USA

Date: 28 May 94 13:28:56 GMT
From: world!barnaby@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Merge the CW test with the Theory Test
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

>Well, it's been several days now and no one seems to want
>to comment on the suggestion that, except for the 5wpm
>exam, that the 13wpm and 20wpm 10 question CW tests simply
>be merged for scoring with the theory tests for general and
>advanced.

>Could it be that those that are so emphatically pro-code
>can offer no argument. Indeed, it seems that such a proposal
>should satisfy both those that are pro-code and those that
>are not. Merging the test scores still retains the
>higher speed CW as a valid mode in terms of testing, but
>it renders it no more important than all the other topics
>that are tested for in the theory exam.

>Remember, before commenting, that my suggestion is to retain
>the 5wpm testing as a stand alone, 70% pass/fail element.
>That retains more than is needed to satisfy international
>treaty requirements.

>But for the general and extra license testing, just
>total the test questions and you pass if you have 75%
>correct...even if you missed every CW test question.

>It sure seems like a reasonable compromise approach for
>now.

Well, Bill, I've been lurking on this debate for a while now
This seems like a VERY workable concept to me.
The argument that there would be increased "pollution" of the

reserved AmExtra CW frequencies shouldn't really matter. If
you can't copy at the speeds run down there, you probably won't
be there, and if CW is "not your mode" then you won't be there
anyway.
I'll second your proposal heartily!
Barnaby AA1IB Richard Barnaby barnaby@world.std.com

Date: Fri, 27 May 1994 19:20:05 GMT
From: walter!dancer.cc.bellcore.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Merge the CW test with the Theory Test
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2s5g2o$qg3@dancer.cc.bellcore.com>,
sohl,william h <whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com> wrote:
>Well, it's been several days now and no one seems to want
>to comment on the suggestion that, except for the 5wpm
>exam, that the 13wpm and 20wpm 10 question CW tests simply
>be merged for scoring with the theory tests for general and
>advanced.
 ^^^^^^^^

OOPS...I should have said Extra.

Sorry for any confusion.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ   email via UUCP   bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays   email via Internet   whs70@cc.bellcore.com

----

Date: Fri, 27 May 1994 19:01:44 GMT
From: walter!dancer.cc.bellcore.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Merge the CW test with the Theory Test
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Well, it's been several days now and no one seems to want
to comment on the suggestion that, except for the 5wpm
exam, that the 13wpm and 20wpm 10 question CW tests simply
be merged for scoring with the theory tests for general and
advanced.

Could it be that those that are so emphatically pro-code
can offer no argument. Indeed, it seems that such a proposal

should satisfy both those that are pro-code and those that
are not. Merging the test scores still retains the
higher speed CW as a valid mode in terms of testing, but
it renders it no more important than all the other topics
that are tested for in the theory exam.

Remember, before commenting, that my suggestion is to retain
the 5wpm testing as a stand alone, 70% pass/fail element.
That retains more than is needed to satisfy international
treaty requirements.

But for the general and extra license testing, just
total the test questions and you pass if you have 75%
correct...even if you missed every CW test question.

It sure seems like a reasonable compromise approach for
now.

Have a safe and pleasant Memorial Day Weekend.

Cheers,

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ   email via UUCP   bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays   email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

----

Date: 29 May 94 01:16:37 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.kei.com!
ssd.intel.com!chnews!cmoore@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: Merge the CW test with the Theory Test
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Michael P. Deignan (md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu) wrote:
: As it is, its nothing more than a biased poll, which for purposes of
: representing the opinions of all amateurs is completely useless.
: -- Michael P. Deignan

Hi Michael, I wonder how we might go about getting an unbiased poll of
this sort? Wonder if we could talk QST, 73, CQ, World Radio, etc. into
running a poll and counting the results? Has a bona fide pole ever been
attempted? A really interesting poll would be exit interviews with all
new hams who have just passed their test. It could be just one more
question on the test. What code speed test do you favor for a General
class license... (a) 13, (b) 10, (c) 5, (d) none at all

I would vote for 5 wpm. That would satisfy the treaty, allow for emergency
communications, give everyone a taste of Morse code, and increase the
average technical expertise within our ranks... yup, the 13 wpm code
requirement keeps out some really top notch RF design engineers and DSP
wizards that I know personally. They might be willing to learn 5 wpm and
help drag us, kicking, screaming, and di-dah-ing into the 21st century.

73, KG7BK, CecilMoore@delphi.com

Date: 28 May 94 13:15:12 GMT
From: agate!library.ucla.edu!psgrain!nntp.cs.ubc.ca!torn!news.unb.ca!
coranto.ucs.mun.ca!nstn.ns.ca!nstn.ns.ca!nntp-user@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: Where and How can I get started
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hello there.
I'm trying to start my own high school radio station and although I,ve been
reading these newsgroups for a while I still am unfamiliar with the terms,
equipment and policies and organizations which I would need to be familiar.
If anyone could send me some generalized info on how i might be able to
get my high school radio station off the ground, then please give me a shout.

Thanks ever so much,
Charles

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #226
****